

EVERGREEN ♦ EAST HILLS VISION STRATEGY

Task Force Meeting - 10

City of San José, New City Hall
200 East Santa Clara Street, Wing 118, 119, 120
San Jose, CA 95113-1905

Monday, June 19, 2006
6:30 – 8:30P.M.

MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order at 6:30p.m.

Task Force Members Present:

Chair Dave Cortese, Vice-chair Nora Campos, Chris Corpus, Jim Zito, Ike White, Jenny Chang, J. Manuel Herrera, Dave Zenker, Homing Yip, Vince Songcayawon, Sylvia Alvarez, Steve Dunn, Al Munoz, Madison Nguyen, Patric Spillane, Mark Milioto, Joe Head, Khanh Nguyen, Mike Hill, Lou Kvitek, Alan Covington, Bob Levy, Carlos DaSilva, Gordon Lund, Melanie Richardson, Carolyn Gonot, Nancy Dellamatera, Steven Cox, George Perez, Maria Lopez

Task Force Members Absent:

None

Members of the Public Present:

Bob Nunez, José Aranda, Tony Seebach, Robert Tedrow, Kari Peterson, Bob Rivet, Shawna Sanders, Stan Perry, Vince Cantore, Gretchen Sawyer, LeAnn Fairweather, Neil Struthers, Alok Gupta, Dan Nguyen, Blu Kennedy, Alla Huff, Pete Castonguay, George Reilly, Alan Garofalo, Jim Rendler, Kent Campbell, Vikki Lang, Debbie Rolands, Michael Luu, Patrick Spillare, Dolores

Developer Community Present:

Tom Armstrong, Bridget Koller

Staff Present:

Cindy Ho, Kip Harkness, Sylvia Do, Rebecca Flores, Dave Mitchell, Manuel Pineda, Nanci Klein, Michael Mena, Laurel Prevetti

Welcome and Announcements

Chair Dave Cortese called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Meeting Summaries and Outreach Calendar

Meeting Summaries

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning Division, asked the Task Force members to reference the meeting summary handouts for the [April 11th](#), Task Force meetings (also available on the website). Laurel Prevetti clarified a statement in a [status memorandum](#) to the City Council from Acting Director Joe Horwedel, dated April 27, 2006. The memorandum stated that a “tentative agreement” was made by the Task Force regarding consensus on items related to industrial land conversion, amount of retail space, percentage of affordable housing, schools, and the amenities package. The Task Force wanted to clarify that the “tentative agreement” referenced in the memorandum was not a “recommendation” or a total agreement/endorsement by the Task Force and that additional work and discussion was needed on each of the items. Staff committed to ensuring more diligence in recognizing sensitive issues and how the Task Force’s recommendations and conclusions are characterized in future meeting summaries and staff reports/memorandums.

Outreach Calendar

Laurel reminded the Task Force that the [Outreach Calendar](#) handout is also available on the EEHVS website and that the website is a good place to review all of the EEHVS related outreach meetings including meeting summaries.

Q&A and Outstanding Items

Laurel also noted that the Questions & Answers and Outstanding Items list was handed out as a reminder to the Task Force of the items addressed and those that are still outstanding. Laurel also informed the Task Force that the Questions & Answers handout is available on the EEHVS website on the [Questions & Answers](#) page. Laurel asked the Task Force to review the list, note any questions that have not been adequately addressed and send that information to staff.

Work Plan Update

Laurel Prevetti proceeded to update the Task Force on the revised/updated Work Plan for the EEHVS. Laurel noted that it is the intention of Planning Staff to ensure the project is heard by the City Council during the current calendar year and the commitment needed by the Task Force to attend the remaining scheduled meetings, as it is critical to meeting the new project timeline. Laurel also noted that the updated [Work Plan](#) is available on the EEHVS website.

Task Force Chair Dave Cortese asked staff whether the schedule is being driven by the technical work that is yet to be completed or by the consensus/recommendation needed by the Task Force. Laurel stated that the majority of the technical work is complete and that the project could be heard by the City Council sooner, should the Task Force reach a recommendation in August. Planning staff could bring the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and the proposed changes to the Evergreen Development Policy earlier than the pending General Plan Amendments, Zoning applications, and Community Facility Districts.

Chair Cortese requested that staff identify a timeline/date when it would be appropriate for individuals on the Task Force to present alternative development proposals. Laurel stated that the August Task Force meetings/workshop would be the appropriate time. However, alternative land use plans would need to be submitted by the end of July 2006 in order to have time to distribute to the rest of the Task Force and their review time.

Vice-Chair Nora Campos asked staff whether allowing the submittal and review of up to 30 potential land use alternatives would impact the current Work Plan. Laurel Prevetti restated and ensured the Task Force that staff will work to bring the proposed EEHVS projects to the City Council in 2006.

Task Force Member James Zito added to the conversation by stating his concern regarding potential delays of the EEHVS project. Mr. Zito asked whether certain action had to be taken by the Task Force and/or the City Council in order to reflect that Task Force Member Bob Levy is no longer a member of the City's Planning Commission. Mr. Zito requested that the Task Force consider retaining Bob Levy as a representative of environmental interests. Task Force Chair Dave Cortese and Vice-Chair Nora Campos recommended that the issue be brought to the City's Rules Committee for discussion/approval. Both the Chair and Vice-Chair agreed that retaining Mr. Levy on the Task Force was the intent of the City Council when the Task Force was appointed, despite any role change(s).

Mr. Zito additionally requested, in the name of keeping the project on schedule, that Vice-Chair Nora Campos suspend the District 5 request, which initiated the City Council review whether or not actions taken by Council Member Dave Cortese in 2005 violated the City Charter. Task Force Chair and Vice-Chair both stated that discussion of the request at the current meeting would potentially be a violation of the Brown Act. Therefore, both the Chair and Vice-Chair suggested that it would be more appropriate for Mr. Zito's comments/concerns be brought to the Rule's Committee on June 21, 2006.

Additional questions from the Task Force inquired whether the current meeting's focus would be on "*Balancing the Equation*" and dwelling unit counts. Laurel Prevetti confirmed that the June 19, 2006, Task Force meeting is intended to have the Task Force reach consensus on the unit counts by the end of August 2006 in order for the project to meet the 2006 timeline.

Task Force Member Ike White stated that the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site needs to be addressed. Mr. White stated that a community workshop was previously held where the community presented staff with several alternate land use plans. One of the alternative land use plans presented at the meeting recommended retaining a minimum of 40% open space on the site. The community has not seen the results of their work brought back to them. Staff recognized the good work that that came out of that meeting and that conclusions of the meeting would be presented during the Task Force meetings in August (alternate land use plan discussion).

Other questions by the Task Force enquired when the funding mechanisms (CFDs) for the Plan would be discussed and presented to the Task Force? Laurel Prevetti mentioned that the review and formation of a possible CFD for the Evergreen project could not be reasonably completed within the current calendar year. However, staff will address funding mechanisms as part of a proposed revision to the Evergreen Development Policy and stated that the City Attorney's Office is currently drafting a Financing Agreement that would ensure the funding of transportation improvements and the "amenity package" attached to this project.

Economic Development Priorities

Nanci Klein, of the Office of Economic Development (OED), was introduced by Laurel Prevetti to inform and frame issues related to economic development, for the Task Force. Nanci Klein stated that the OED is very respectful of the hard work and thought process the Task Force has shown to date. With that said the OED would like to continue to bring forward the City's concern regarding the loss of significant amounts of industrial land needed for future job and revenue growth for the City. The City's Economic Development Strategy, identified in the *San José 2020 General Plan*, provides the context and direction for citywide economic vitality.

Since 2000, approximately 755 acres of industrial land have been converted to non-industrial uses, primarily residential uses. Approximately 400 additional acres (including the EEHVS project) are currently under threat to be converted via pending applications on file with the Planning Division. Converting the pending 400 acres of industrial land would amount to the conversion of roughly 10% of the City's industrial land base in a 2 year time period. Industrial development adds revenue to the general fund, which pays for vital services such as Police, Fire, and community center staffing. Depletion of the City's industrial land base would add to the City's current budget deficit of approximately \$297 million.

Staff and consultants have acknowledged that retail and the retention of jobs can help keep vehicle trips within the Evergreen area and somewhat ease overall traffic patterns. The City recommends the careful consideration of building and/or retaining capacity for retail and small business as part of the Evergreen East Hills Vision Strategy (EEHVS). Additionally, the City encourages the Task Force to consider retaining the full 500,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses as part of the EEHVS.

In conclusion, staff recognizes that the Task Force's work is challenging in its desire to strive for a balanced community amongst competing needs. Staff is committed to continue its support to the Task Force by raising important citywide issues such as the retention of jobs, revenue generation, and retail/quality of life options for existing and future residents in the Evergreen area.

The Task Force engaged in discussion related to the industrial conversion issue. Task Force comments included:

- If zero industrial land is retained in the Evergreen area, then we [City] need to add industrial land elsewhere (“no net loss”).
- We need to look at impacts on industrial land from a square footage perspective rather than acreage. Industrial development is currently being built in denser products and therefore the job loss issue may not be as critical as it appears when looking at it on an acreage basis.
- We [City] need to concentrate on job numbers and where they are located.
- We need to differentiate between the various industrial uses (i.e., Heavy Industrial, Light Industrial, Industrial Park, etc.). The primary importance is the retention of the City’s heavy and light industrial job base.
- The argument that the Campus Industrial land in Evergreen is not marketable is not a valid reason to convert. The Hitachi Industrial Campus is an example where a large high-tech company chose to locate in Evergreen. It only takes one user to make a property marketable.
- We should be locating jobs in close proximity to where people live. Converting the industrial land in Evergreen will continue to push morning traffic in a westerly and northerly direction where the jobs are.

Balancing the Equation (continued from April 11th)

Introduction

The facilitator, Kip Harkness explained the purpose of the balancing the equation exercise. The purpose of this agenda item is needed to scope the Task Force’s recommendation on the range of dwelling units that may be acceptable on each of the four opportunity sites. In order to help scope the preferred dwelling unit counts for each site, the Task Force was requested to identify their “interests” which would sway the preferred unit counts toward higher or lower density developments. Kip Harkness provided examples, which included the need for an appropriate amount of affordable housing. This would require that the densities on each site be at the higher end in order to achieve a feasible project. Another example would address the “interest” of having reduced traffic impacts, which may push the preferred densities on each site to be at the lower end (fewer units).

A “scaling” board was used to identify the preferred densities/unit counts for each site. Listed below are the interests of the Task Force that drove the “chips” on the board up or down to the respective units desired for each site. The interest identified by the Task Force fell into a category of higher density interest or lower density interest.

Site 1 (Arcadia) – Unit Range 1,875 to 1,000

*Interest that push for **higher** number of units:*

- In order to determine what the amenity package, amount affordable housing, and traffic looked like the 1,875-unit number was requested to be looked at.
- The neighborhood adjacent to the Arcadia is concerned that this site is becoming a “dumping ground” for the amenity package. The site should serve the West Evergreen needs and not all of Evergreen’s needs.
- The subject site is restricted due the airport approach zone and the park area proposed to be dedicated by the developer. Therefore, if the 1,875 units are needed to generate the desired amenity’s package, a higher density project will be developed.
- Given the location of this site along Capital Expressway it is the only property where it is favored for higher density development.

*Interest that push for **lower** number of units:*

- Lower units can still generate an amenities package.
- Community still has concerns over traffic generated from development of the site.
- The neighborhood adjacent to Arcadia is concerned that this site is becoming a “dumping ground” for the amenity package. The site should serve the West Evergreen needs and not all of Evergreen’s needs.

Site 2 (Pleasant Hills Golf Course) – Unit Range 755 to 600

*Interest that push for **higher** number of units:*

- There does not appear to be any difference between a development with 755 units or 600 units.

*Interest that push for **lower** number of units:*

- The community’s first preference is to have no development on the site.
- The community would accept a development proposal of 600 units and the associated school, if development is inevitable.
- New development should be developed at a scale, which will be compatible with the surrounding single-family neighborhood.
- Future development should keep as much open space as possible (40% minimum).
- Traffic impacts are a concern, specifically with Flint Avenue. Fewer units will generate fewer vehicle trips.

Site 3 (Berg/IDS/Legacy Partners) – Unit Range 1,950 to 900

Continued to the next Task Force Meeting

Site 4 (Evergreen Valley College Site) – Unit Range 500 to 300

*Interest that push for **higher** number of units:*

- The Evergreen Valley College needs a minimum range of 400 to 500 units in order to include a “workforce” housing component as part of the project.
- There is a need/demand for teacher housing

*Interest that push for **lower** number of units:*

- Development needs to be compatible with the adjacent neighborhood in density and scale.
- The community would like low scale massing of the future development (no 3 and 4 story buildings).
- Other concerns of potential future development included the retail component of the project (i.e., type of retail proposed/full service grocery store).

Public Comments

Attendees of the Task Force meeting, Mr. Gupta, Ms. Peterson, Ms. Roelands, Ms. Huff, and Mr. Rivet, all spoke during the public comment period of the agenda. The public comments at the meeting addressed the following issues:

- General opposition to the additional development proposed by the developers.
- There appears to be a direct conflict/contradiction by saying the “Plan” will raise the quality of life for the Evergreen residence when the EIR has identified that the “Plan” will result in more traffic impacts, less job opportunities, and worsen the overcrowding of schools.
- Concern with the inadequate local educational facilities.
- Silver Creek High School is already overcrowded and that the ESUHSD is not solving the overcrowding problem.
- Requested that the Task Force ensure a site is set-aside for a new High School.
- The Task Force and City should address the educational deficiencies before moving forward with the proposed developments.

Task Force Discussion on Next Meeting

The Task Force requested that staff come back with additional information regarding the state of the City’s remaining industrial land base and its history of land use conversion to non-industrial uses. Additionally, the Task Force requested that staff notify its members as to an appropriate deadline for receiving “alternative” land use plans in order to review them at the next Task Force Meeting in August 2006.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.